

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1 to 8, 11 to 29, and 32 to 44, have been canceled. Claims 9, 10, 30, and 31 have been amended (strikeouts and brackets indicating deleted text and underlining indicating added text). No new matter has been added. New claims 45 to 84 have been added. Claims 9, 10, 30, 31, and 45 to 84 are currently pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 11, 12, 24, and 36, Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 11, 12, 24, and 36, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as assertedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 3, 11, 12, 24, and 36, have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the newly presented claims meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

III. Rejection of Claims 3, 10, 11, 15, 24, 31, 36, and 43, Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 10, 11, 15, 24, 31, 36, and 43, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as assertedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The present rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 3, 11, 15, 24, 36, and 43, have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection with respect to claims 3, 11, 15, 24, 36, and 43 moot.

With respect to claims 10 and 31, while Applicants do not agree with the merits of the rejection, to facilitate matters, the claims have been amended herein without prejudice to recite "the data of the hierarchical data file is modifiable by the second user, and the modified data is locally savable," thus obviating the present rejection with respect to claims 10 and 31.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 31 is therefore respectfully requested.

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2006**

With respect to new claim 80, which recites “an article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions which, when executed, define a series of steps to be used to control a method for modification of stored documents,” and which recites the steps of the method, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, such a claim is not classified as a hybrid claim. See M.P.E.P. § 2106(IV)(B). The claimed subject matter, *i.e.*, an article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions which, when executed, define a series of steps to be used to control a particular method, which is further defined, is clear and definite.

Accordingly, new claim 80 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1 to 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as assertedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As an initial matter, claims 1 to 8, and 11 to 21 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection with respect to these claims moot.

As for claims 9 and 10, while Applicants do not agree with the merits of the rejection, to facilitate matters, these claims have been amended herein without prejudice to recite “a processor,” thus obviating the present rejection with respect to claims 9 and 10.

V. Rejection of Claims 1 to 7, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22 to 28, 33, 34, 38, and 41 to 44, Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 to 7, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22 to 28, 33, 34, 38, and 41 to 44, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,017,112 (“the Collie reference”).

Claims 1 to 7, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22 to 28, 33, 34, 38, and 41 to 44, have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

VI. Rejection of Claims 12 and 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Collie reference.

Claims 12 and 32 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2006**

VII. Rejection of Claims 8, 16, 19, 29, 35, and 40, Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 16, 19, 29, 35, and 40, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Collie reference in view of Young, Microsoft Office System Inside Out: 2003 Edition, October 23, 2003, pages 1-15 (“the Young reference”).

Claims 8, 16, 19, 29, 35, and 40, have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 11 and 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Collie reference and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0102683 (“the Khanuja reference”).

Claims 11 and 36 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

IX. Rejection of Claims 15 and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Collie reference in view of the Young reference and further in view of the Khanuja reference.

Claims 15 and 37 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

X. Rejection of Claims 18 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 18 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Collie reference in view of Korpela, Tab Separated Values (TSV): a format for tabular data exchange, October 20, 2001, pages 1-6 (“the Korpela reference”).

Claims 18 and 39 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thus rendering the present rejection moot.

XI. New Claims 45 to 84

Claims 45 to 84 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 45 to 84 do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification.

Claim 45 relates to a computer system for modification of stored documents. Claim 62 relates to a computer-implemented method for modification of stored documents. Claim 80 relates to an article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions adapted to be executed by a processor, the instructions which, when executed, define a series of steps to be used to control a method for modification of stored documents. Each of claims 45, 62, and 80, provides for extracting data from a document, associating the extracted data with metadata from a metadata file describing the extracted data, and storing the extracted data and the metadata in a user-modifiable tab separated file, which when opened displays the extracted data and the metadata, or a processor configured to perform the extracting, associating, and storing.

The references cited in the present Office Action, each alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest these features. The Collie reference provides for importing data from an XML document into a spreadsheet and maintaining a mapping between cells of the spreadsheet and the source XML document so that, upon export, the XML document can be generated once again from the data of the spreadsheet. It is respectfully submitted that the Collie reference does not disclose, for example, extracting data from the XML document, associating the extracted data from the XML document with metadata from a metadata file, and importing both the data from the XML document and the metadata from the metadata file into the spreadsheet.

The Collie reference requires a user to be aware of mappings of cells of a spreadsheet to portions of a source XML document. In contrast, claims 45, 62, and 80, provide for appending to data extracted from a source document metadata for display in a tab separated file. While the extraction of the data from the source document may provide a user with the extracted data for modification and additionally discourage modification of layout of the data in the source document since the data has been stripped of its original layout when instead stored in the tab separated file, the appended metadata may allow the user the ability to discern a certain

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2006**

level of context of the data elements that provides enough meaning to the data to allow the user to modify the data without requiring the user to be aware of and reference a mapping between cells of the tab separated file and the source document from which the data was extracted.

Indeed, the Collie reference does not disclose or suggest extracting data from a document, associating the extracted data with metadata from a metadata file describing the extracted data, and storing the extracted data and the metadata in a user-modifiable tab separated file, which when opened displays the extracted data and the metadata, or a processor configured to perform these steps. Thus, the Collie reference does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of claims 45, 62, and 80. The Young, Khanuja, and Korpela references do not correct the deficiencies noted above with respect to the Collie reference. Accordingly, the cited references do not render unpatentable any of claims 45, 62, and 80.

Claim 81 relates to a computer system for modification of stored documents. Claim 83 relates to a computer-implemented method for modification of stored documents. Each of claims 81 and 83 provides for extracting data from a document having a graphical layout component, where the data represents completed fields of the document arranged according to the graphical layout component in order to provide a context for the data, where the context is provided without reference to metadata describing the extracted data and stored in a metadata file; associating the extracted data with the metadata; and storing the extracted data and the metadata in a user-modifiable file, which when opened displays the extracted data and the metadata file, or a processor configured to perform the extracting, associating, and storing.

The references cited in the present Office Action, each alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest these features. With respect to the Collie reference, the spreadsheet does not provide a context by layout of the data. Instead, with respect to the spreadsheet of the Collie reference, one may discern a context of data within particular cells by reference to a mapping of the cells to XML data of an XML document. Thus, exportation of data from the spreadsheet to the XML document does not disclose or suggest the features recited in either of claims 81 and 83.

With respect to importation of data from the XML document of the Collie reference into the spreadsheet, as set forth above in support of the patentability of claims 45, 62, and 80, the Collie reference does not disclose or suggest extracting data from a stored document,

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2006**

associating the extracted data with metadata from a metadata file, and storing the extracted data and metadata in a user-modifiable file, which when opened displays the extracted data and metadata. Thus, the Collie reference does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in either of claims 81 and 83. Since the Young, Khanuja, and Korpela references do not correct the deficiencies noted above with respect to the Collie reference, the cited references do not render unpatentable either of claims 81 and 83.

Remaining claims 46 to 61, 63 to 79, 82, and 84 depend from claims 45, 62, 81, and 83, and therefore include all of the features recited in those respective claims. The cited references therefore do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the same reasons noted above with respect to those respective claims.

XII. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter contained in claims 9, 10, 30, and 31.

In this regard, the Examiner will note that each of claims 9 (from which claim 10 depends) and 30 (from which claim 31 depends), has been rewritten herein in independent form to include all of the limitations of its respective base claim and any intervening claims.

Further, with respect to claims 9, 10, and 31, as set forth above, these claims have been amended herein without prejudice to obviate the 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 101 rejections of these claims.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 9, 10, 30, and 31 are in condition for immediate allowance.

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/789,721
Attorney Docket No. 11884/411001
Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2006**

XIII. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Grunberger
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646